

# UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER
AD848967
NEW LIMITATION CHANGE
TO Approved for public release, distribution unlimited
FROM Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors; Administrative/Operational Use; JAN 1968. Other requests shall be referred to Air Force Armament Laboratory, Attn: ATWD, Eglin AFB, FL 32542.
AUTHORITY
ADTC, USAF ltr, 26 Sep 1969

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

AD848967

AFATL-TR-68-12

**DYNAMIC DROP AND VIBRATION TESTS  
OF A CNU-104/E SHIPPING CONTAINER**

Dave Bogan  
Nash-Hammond, Inc.

TECHNICAL REPORT AFATL-TR-68-12

**JANUARY 1968**

This document is subject to special export controls and each transmittal to foreign governments or foreign nationals may be made only with prior approval of the Air Force Armament Laboratory (ATWD), Eglin AFB, Florida 32542.

**AIR FORCE ARMAMENT LABORATORY  
AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND**

**EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA**

DDC  
RECEIVED  
MAR 17 1968

**DYNAMIC DROP AND VIBRATION TESTS  
OF A CNU-104/E SHIPPING CONTAINER**

**Dave Bogan**

**This document is subject to special export controls and each transmittal to foreign governments or foreign nationals may be made only with prior approval of the Air Force Armament Laboratory (ATWD), Eglin AFB, Florida 32542.**


FOREWORD

This program was authorized by U. S. Air Force Contract No. F08635-67-C-0049 during the period 19 December 1966 to 9 May 1967. The program monitor for the project was Captain R. Bennett (ATWD), Air Force Armament Laboratory, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, in conjunction with Dr. Harry Freeman, Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, New Jersey.

Nash-Hammond, Inc., Industry, California, was responsible for the manufacture and tests of the Shipping Container.

Information in this report is embargoed under the Department of State International Traffic In Arms Regulations. This report may be released to foreign governments by departments or agencies of the U. S. Government subject to approval of the Air Force Armament Laboratory (ATWD), Eglin AFB, Florida 32542, or higher authority within the Department of the Air Force. Private individuals or firms require a Department of State export license.

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved.

  
C. K. ARPKE, Lt. Colonel, USAF  
Acting Chief, Weapons Division

# ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of two dynamics: Rough Handling and Vibration tests of a CNU-104/E Shipping Container. The container was designed to protect the fully loaded TFDM dispenser and pallet from damage during shipment. The purpose of the tests was to ascertain the practicability of a rotationally molded high density linear polyethylene shipping container to provide protection during shipment and long-term storage. Two test specimens, No. 1 and No. 2 for vibration testing, and one test specimen for rough handling testing, were subjected to all tests with successful results. The procedures and results presented within this report include those performed outside the facilities of Nash-Hammond industry.

This document is subject to special export controls and each transmittal to foreign governments or foreign nationals may be made only with prior approval of the Air Force Armament Laboratory (ATWD), Eglin AFB, Florida 32542.

## CONTENTS

Section	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
1. General	1
2. Test Objective	1
II. TEST PACKAGE	2
1. General	2
2. Weapon Cylinder	2
III. TEST PROCEDURE	4
1. Instrumentation System	4
IV. TEST RESULTS	7
1. General	7
2. Rough Handling Tests	8
3. Environmental and Vibration Tests	9
V. EVALUATIONS	16
VI. CONCLUSIONS	17
VII. RECOMMENDATIONS	18
APPENDIX - Description of Test Equipment	19

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Page
1. Exploded Schematic View of CNU-104/E Shipping Container	3
2. Location of Accelerometers, Rough Handling Test	5
3. Location of Accelerometers, Vibration Test	6
4. Vibration Test, Vertical Axis	11
5. Vibration Test, Lateral Axis	12
6. Vibration Test, Longitudinal Axis	13
7. Rough Handling Test, 9" Forward End Impact	23
8. Rough Handling Test, 9" Aft End Impact	24
9. Rough Handling Test, 24" Aft Right Corner	25
10. Rough Handling Test, 24" Forward Left Corner	26
11. Rough Handling Test, 24" Forward End Drop	27
12. Rough Handling Test, 24" Aft End Drop	28

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Summary of Peak Acceleration	7
II. Frequency and Vibration Test Schedule	10
III. Frequencies, Vibration Amplitude, and Time Durations	14
IV. Resonant Dwell Test Schedule	15

## SECTION I

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1. GENERAL

The feasibility of using a plastic material in the form of a shipping container having a load of 840 lb exceeding 1 lb psi, heretofore, was deemed impractical. With the process known as "Rotation Molding" together with the development of "High Density Linear Polyethylene" for this process, a double wall container which is able to sustain such loads was deemed possible and, indeed, practical. The double wall container design has a built-in shock absorbing agent in that the inner wall cradles the item (TFDM Dispenser) enabling it to move with the shock. No additional internal cushioning is necessary if the TFDM Dispenser is fairly rugged and is able to function after a 30g shock.

Rotational molding has an inherent quality peculiar only to the process in that angles and radii have a built-up thickness as compared to a flat side. This automatically puts the strength where it is most needed in container application. This container, hereafter referred to as the CNU-104/E, was developed for the U. S. Air Force by Nash-Hammond, Inc., City of Industry, California, under Contract No. F08635-67-C-0049.

#### 2. TEST OBJECTIVE

The objective of this test program was to evaluate the CNU-104/E Shipping Container under dynamic test conditions which are as follows:

<u>Test Number</u>	<u>Description</u>
	Rough Handling
1	Forward End Pendulum
2	Aft End Pendulum
3	Aft Right Corner Drop
4	Forward Left Corner Drop
5	Forward End Drop
6	Aft End Drop
	Environmental and Vibration
7	Pressure (unloaded)
8	High Temperature (unloaded)
9	Low Temperature (unloaded)
10	Vibration (loaded)



SECTION II  
TEST PACKAGE

1. GENERAL

An exploded schematic view of the CNU-104/E Shipping Container is shown in Figure 1. The components of the Container are indicated on the drawing. The approximate dimensions of the assembled Container were 24-1/2 inches in width, 29-1/8 inches in height, and 153-1/4 inches in length. The gross weight of the unloaded Container was approximately 189 pounds including the foam fill.

2. WEAPON CYLINDER

The weapon cylinder consisted of a functioning TFDM, dummy loaded stainless steel cylinder. The weapon was furnished by the Air Force. Figure 1 shows the weapon installed in the lower half of the Shipping Container.




Figure 1. Exploded Schematic View of the CNU-104/E Shipping Container

### SECTION III

#### TEST PROCEDURE

#### 1. INSTRUMENTATION SYSTEM

##### a. Rough Handling Tests

Five accelerometers were used to measure the vertical and lateral accelerations at each end of the TFDM Dispenser and the longitudinal acceleration at the centerline. The accelerometers were connected to CEC System D galvanometer carrier amplifiers consisting of one power supply and master oscillator type 2-i05A, and eight channels of type 1-113B carrier amplifiers. The galvanometer carrier amplifiers were connected to a CEC type 5-116 P4-14 recording oscillograph equipped with eight type 7-323 fluid damped galvanometers.

The accelerometers were bonded to the Shipping Container with pressure sensitive adhesive tape. Access for the electrical cables was provided by a 1/2-inch diameter hole in one forward side of the Container. Figure 2 shows the location of the accelerometers.

##### b. Vibration Tests

The Shipping Container and its contents were vibrated in three major mutually perpendicular axes on an MB Electronics Vibration Exciter, which utilized a type T-68 vibration control console. Six piezoelectric type accelerometers were used. One accelerometer was used for vibration input control on the test fixture, and the remaining five accelerometers were used to monitor the response of the TFDM Dispenser located internally within the Shipping Container under test. Figure 3 illustrates the location of the accelerometers for each axis of vibration testing.

During the resonant survey test for each axis, the accelerometer output was recorded on a direct writing Bristol Temperature Recorder, Model M/N 20PG560-21. For a complete description of test equipment used in the execution of the tests indicated, and for pressure, high temperature, and low temperature tests, see the appendix section of this document.





Figure 2. Location of Accelerometers, Rough Handling Test



LEGEND : ACCELEROMETER NO 2 - SENSING VERTICAL MOTION  
 ACCELEROMETER NO 3 - SENSING LONGITUDINAL MOTION  
 ACCELEROMETER NO 4 - SENSING LATERAL MOTION  
 ACCELEROMETER NO 5 - SENSING LATERAL MOTION  
 ACCELEROMETER NO 6 - SENSING VERTICAL MOTION  
 CONTROL ACCELEROMETER NO 1 WAS ATTACHED TO TEST  
 FIXTURE FOR EACH AXIS OF VIBRATION

Figure 3. Location of Accelerometers, Vibration Test

# SECTION IV

## TEST RESULTS

### 1. GENERAL

#### a. Description of Rough Handling Tests

The rough handling tests performed on the loaded Container were conducted in accordance with Military Standard MIL-STD-810, Method 516 (Procedure III), at ambient temperature and are described in Section I, paragraph 2. Channel 6 (aft lateral accelerometer) did not function during the tests. This condition was discovered after the first drop, but since the Container was banded closed and the level of the lateral accelerations was minimal, it was decided to proceed with the tests without this channel. The rough handling test results are described in Table I. The values are given in terms of g units ( $1g = 32.2 \text{ ft/sec}^2$ ) and since these are peak values they do not necessarily happen at the same instant of time.

#### b. Description of Environmental and Vibration Tests

The environmental tests performed on the loaded Container were conducted in accordance with Military Standard MIL-STD-810, Methods 500, 502, 501, and 514, at ambient temperature, under standard laboratory conditions, and are described in Section I, paragraph 2.

TABLE I. SUMMARY OF PEAK ACCELERATION

Record No.	Height (inches)	Description	2 FL	3 FV	4 L	5 AV
2500	9	Forward End Pendulum	0.9	2.2	3.4	2.3
2501	9	Aft End Pendulum	0.4	2.6	3.3	3.0
2502	24	Aft Right Corner	3.0	6.5	1.6	10.2
2503	24	Forward Left Corner	4.9	10.2	2.0	6.4
2504	24	Forward End Drop	1.0	24.3	4.1	10.4
2505	24	Aft End Drop	1.8	10.4	4.1	24.6

Reference should be made to Figures 7 through 12 in the Appendix for time correlation.

## 2. ROUGH HANDLING TESTS

### a. Pendulum Input Tests (refer to Table I for "g" values)

#### (1) Dispenser Movement, Forward End

The Dispenser (without cones) was located in the Shipping Container 33 inches from aft end to outside Container wall. During impact, the dispenser moved forward 1.50 inches to 34.50 inches. A visual inspection of the Shipping Container and dispenser revealed no evidence of damage.

#### (2) Pendulum, Forward End

The loaded Shipping Container was raised 17.50 inches off a concrete slab and continued to be raised on an arc until C.G. was 26.50 inches. The Shipping Container was then released, butting into a 6-inch concrete wall. A visual inspection of the Shipping Container and dispenser revealed no evidence of damage.

#### (3) Dispenser Movement, Aft End

Dispenser (without cones) was located 34.5 inches from aft end of dispenser to outside of Container end wall. During impact, dispenser moved forward 3.0 inches to 31.50 inches. Inside clearance of dispenser, with cones, to inside wall of Container is 6.0 inches at both forward and aft ends.

#### (4) Pendulum, Aft End

The loaded Shipping Container was raised until C.G. was at 19.5 inches off a concrete slab, then continued to be raised on an arc until C.G. was 28.50 inches. Container was then released, butting into a 6-inch concrete wall. A visual inspection of the Shipping Container and dispenser revealed no evidence of damage.

### b. Corner Drop Tests

#### (1) Forward End

One 5-inch block and one 12-inch block were placed under the forward corners of the loaded Container. The aft end was then raised to a height of 24 inches and released for a free fall drop to the concrete floor. A visual inspection of the Shipping Container and dispenser revealed no evidence of damage.

#### (2) Aft End

One 5-inch block and one 12-inch block were placed under forward corners of the loaded Shipping Container. The aft end was then raised to a height of 24 inches and released for a free fall drop to the concrete floor. A visual inspection of the Shipping Container and dispenser revealed no evidence of damage.

c. Edgewise Drop Tests

(1) Forward End

One 6-inch block, 12 inches long, was centered under the aft end of the Shipping Container. The forward end was raised to a height of 24 inches and then released for a free fall drop onto a concrete floor. A visual inspection of the Container revealed that structural damage had occurred. The aft end buckled at a point centered in the bottom end, protruding approximately 1.50 inches. This condition was caused by the corners of the aft end not being supported by the 12-inch long block. However, no evidence of damage to the dispenser was revealed.

(2) Aft End

One 6-inch block, 24 inches long, was centered under the forward end of the Shipping Container. The aft end was then raised to a height of 24 inches and released for a free fall drop onto a concrete floor. A visual inspection of the Container and dispenser revealed no evidence of damage.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL AND VIBRATION TESTS

a. Pressure Test

The unloaded Shipping Container (test specimen No. 1) was placed within a suitable altitude test chamber. Pressure within the test chamber was reduced to 3.44 Hg (50,000 feet above sea level) and was maintained at this pressure for a period of one hour. Internal chamber temperature during the test period was uncontrolled.

At the conclusion of the one-hour period, the test chamber was returned to atmospheric conditions. The test specimen was examined for evidence of structural or mechanical damage. The Shipping Container inspection revealed no evidence of damage.

b. High Temperature Test

The unloaded Shipping Container (test specimen No. 1) was placed within a suitable high-temperature test chamber. Temperature within the test chamber was increased to 160°F (71.1°C) and maintained at this temperature for a period of 48 hours. At the conclusion of the 48-hour period, the test chamber was returned to laboratory ambient test conditions. The test specimen was examined externally for evidence of structural or mechanical damage and deterioration. The Shipping Container inspection revealed no evidence of damage.

c. Low Temperature Test

The unloaded Shipping Container (test specimen No. 1) was placed in a suitable low-temperature test chamber. The test chamber's internal temperature was lowered to -80°F (62.2°C) and was held at this temperature for a period of 48 hours. At the conclusion of the 48-hour period, the door to the test chamber was opened and the test specimen was allowed to return to laboratory ambient test conditions.



After stabilization, at laboratory ambient test conditions, the test specimen was examined externally for any evidence of damage or deterioration. The Shipping Container inspection revealed no evidence of damage.

#### d. Vibration Test

The Shipping Container and its contents (test sample No. 2) were rigidly attached to the vibration exciter (Figure 4) and were vibrated in accordance with requirements of MIL-STD-810, at ambient temperature. During the resonant dwell test in each axis, "short bursts" of the accelerometers were recorded at five-minute intervals during testing between 2 to 26 Hz and at the beginning and end of each resonant dwell between 26 to 300 Hz. Vibration testing was conducted as follows:

##### (1) Resonant Search

While rigidly attached to the vibration exciter, the test sample was subjected to a resonant search test in each of the test samples three major mutually perpendicular axes as set forth in Figures 4, 5, and 6. The resonant search test was conducted at the frequencies and vibration inputs set forth in Table II.

TABLE II. FREQUENCY AND VIBRATION TEST SCHEDULE

Frequency (Hz)	Vibration Input
2 to 10 to 2	0.13" DA
10 to 17 to 10	0.09" DA
17 to 20 to 17	1.3 g
26 to 52 to 26	0.036" DA
52 to 300 to 52	5.0 g

During performance of the resonant search test, the oscillograph recorder was continuously operated to determine test sample response.

##### (2) Vibration Cycling Test

At the conclusion of the resonant search test in each axis, the test sample was subjected to vibrations cycling at the frequencies, vibration amplitudes, and time durations as set forth in Table III.

At the conclusion of each frequency range, the test sample was externally examined for evidence of damage or deterioration. The Shipping Container inspection revealed no evidence of damage.




Figure 4. Vibration Test, Vertical Axis




Figure 5. Vibration Test, Lateral Axis



Figure 6. Vibration Test, Longitudinal Axis

TABLE III. FREQUENCIES, VIBRATION AMPLITUDES, AND TIME DURATIONS

Frequency Range (Hz)	Cycling Time Duration (minutes)	Vibration Input
2 to 6 to 2	10	0.5 g*
6 to 9 to 6	10	0.3" DA
9 to 26 to 9	30	1.3 g
26 to 52 to 26	20	0.036" DA
52 to 300 to 52	50	5.0 g

\*Vibration input was limited to 1" DA or 0.5g, whichever was the limiting factor.

(3) Resonant Dwell Test

At the conclusion of the vibration cycling test in each axis, the test sample was subjected to a resonant dwell test at the most severe resonant frequency in each frequency range set forth in Table II. The resonant dwell test was conducted at the resonant frequencies, vibration input levels, and time durations set forth in Table IV.

At the conclusion of each resonant frequency dwell noted in Table III, the test sample was externally examined for evidence of damage or deterioration. The Shipping Container inspection revealed no evidence of damage.

TABLE IV. RESONANT DWELL TEST SCHEDULE

Resonant Frequency (Hz)	Axis	Vibration Input	Dwell Time (minutes)	Accelerometer Response (g)				
				Accel. No.				
				2	3	4	5	6
10	Vertical	0.13" DA	70	0.6	0	0.2	0.6	0
17	Vertical	0.09" DA	70	0.8	0	0	0.7	0
50	Vertical	0.036" DA	60	3	1	2	2	1.2
93	Vertical	5.0 g	30	1.2	1.1	2	2	1.2
195	Vertical	5.0 g	30	1.2	0.5	2	3.3	0.8
10	Lateral	0.13" DA	3	3	0.9	2.8	1.6	1.8
17	Lateral	0.09" DA	3	3	1.0	3	2	2.5
24	Lateral	1.3 g	3	3	1.0	3.5	2.5	2.5
51	Lateral	0.036" DA	7	7	2	7	7	5
90	Lateral	5.0 g	4	4	1	8	6	4
10	Longitudinal	0.13" DA	2	2	1	4	1	1
22	Longitudinal	1.3 g	1.3	1.3	1	1.8	0.5	0.4
52	Longitudinal	5.0 g	3	3	2	2	1	1
170	Longitudinal	5.0 g	3	3	1	5	1	1
290	Longitudinal	5.0 g	3	3	0.5	5	2	0.8

## SECTION V

### EVALUATION

The Shipping Container demonstrated satisfactory achievement of the design objectives, without exception, although the only visual damage to the container occurred during the Edgewise Drop Test, Forward End. The insignificant buckling that occurred, visual at the time of impact, returned to normal twelve (12) hours after test, leaving a slight stress line and with no visual damage to the dispenser at any time during the tests.

## SECTION VI

### CONCLUSIONS

The Shipping Container suffered only superficial damage as a result of the tests described in the proceeding paragraphs. The test results indicate no subsequent malfunction nor affected reusability of the Container. There was no evident damage to the TFDM Dispenser after the rough-handling and vibration tests. On the basis of these findings, it is reasonable to conclude that rotationally molded, high density polyethylene, double wall Shipping Containers will adequately protect the dispenser from such shock and vibration as might be encountered during shipment and storage.

The dimensional limitations of containers manufactured by this process have not been determined; however, it is the consensus of opinion that a 24-foot length Container would be approaching the limit. The state of the art is rapidly improving not only in the physical properties of the basic material and manufacturing methods, but also in the economics involved.



## SECTION VII

### RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. The bottom of the Container be partially foam filled between the fork lift areas to facilitate closing, due to slight warpage of the closure when loaded. The warpage occurs approximately one hour after the lid has been removed. If the contents have not been removed from the Shipping Container after one hour, warpage will result and replacement of the lid on Shipping Container becomes difficult. Foam fill will correct this situation. If contents are removed, however, any warpage will correct itself due to the memory characteristics of the plastic material.
2. The black color be used because of its resistance to ultraviolet rays. This material has been known to have an outside storage life expectancy exceeding twenty years.
3. The method of closure used be nylon strapping, as this is deemed much more practical than latch-type closures in three respects: a) quicker access to the contents; b) no maintenance required; and c) the additional cost of latches is not justified.

APPENDIX  
DESCRIPTION OF TEST EQUIPMENT

Nomenclature

Characteristics

Vibration Exciter

MB Electronics  
M/N C-21-  
CEL No. 2-156

Range: 5 to 2000 Hz  
28,000 Force lb/sine  
25,000 Force lb/random  
Accuracy: Waveform distortion -  
±15% fs output  
Calib. Interval: 6 months

Vibration Control Console

MB Electronics  
M/N T-68  
CEL No. 2-162

Range: 5 to 10,000 Hz  
Accuracy: ±5.0% rdg.  
Calib. Interval: 1 month

Vibration Power Supply

MB Electronics  
M/N 999  
S/N 105  
CEL No. 2-161

Range: 5 to 5000 Hz  
78 kW output  
Accuracy: Externally instrumented  
Calib. Interval: NA

Temperature, Humidity Chamber

10' x 20' x 20'  
CEL  
M/N H-LT-H1900  
S/N 1  
CEL No. 2-171

Range: -80°F to +200°F; 95% RH  
Accuracy: ±3.6°F; ±5.0% RH  
Calib. Interval: Prior to use

Electronic EPUT Counter

Syston Donner  
M/N 1032  
S/N 205  
CEL No. 1-191

Range: Frequency - 0 Hz to 1.0 mc  
Period - 1 microsec to 10 sec  
Accuracy: ±0.1 ppm/day; ±1 digit  
Calib. Interval: 12 months

Millivolt Indicator

Minneapolis-Honeywell  
M/N 126W3V-11-111-IV-TZ  
S/N 942671  
CEL No. 3-554

Range: 0 to 71 mV; 2 channels  
Accuracy: ±0.05% mV  
Calib. Interval: 6 months

Temperature Recorder

Bristol Co.  
M/N 20PG560-21  
S/N 645119  
CEL No. 3-570-2

Range: -100°F to +500°F  
1 channel; CC thermocouple  
Accuracy: ±0.5% fs  
Calib. Interval: 3 months

APPENDIX (cont)

Nomenclature

Characteristics

Power Supply

Unholtz-Dickie Corp.  
M/N 608PS-1  
S/N 126  
CEL No. 3-684

Range: NA  
Accuracy: NA  
Calib. Interval: NA

Auto Ranger Modules (2)

Unholtz-Dickie Corp.  
M/N 8PMCVA  
CEL No. 3-684-1  
CEL No. 3-684-2

Range: Charge Mode - Sensitivity -  
1 to 100 pcmb (peak)/g (peak)  
Frequency response -  
10 Hz to 10 kHz =  $\pm 1\%$   
5 Hz to 10 kHz =  $\pm 2\%$   
3 Hz to 10 kHz =  $\pm 4\%$   
Voltage Mode -  
1 to 100 mV (peak)/g (peak)  
Accuracy: Gain -  $\pm 1.5\%$  at any point on  
the dial  
Meter -  $\pm 1\%$  fs  
Calib. Interval: Prior to use

Power Supply

Unholtz-Dickie Corp.  
M/N 608PS-1  
S/N 112  
CEL No. 3-685

Range: NA  
Accuracy: NA  
Calib. Interval: NA

Auto Ranger Modules (2)

Unholtz-Dickie Corp.  
M/N 8PMCVA  
CEL No. 3-685-1  
CEL No. 3-685-2

Range: Charge Mode - Sensitivity -  
1 to 100 pcmb (peak)/g (peak)  
Frequency response -  
10 Hz to 10 kHz =  $\pm 1\%$   
5 Hz to 10 kHz =  $\pm 2\%$   
3 Hz to 10 kHz =  $\pm 4\%$   
Voltage Mode -  
1 to 100 mV (peak)/g (peak)  
Accuracy: Gain -  $\pm 1.5\%$  at any point on  
the dial  
Meter -  $\pm 1\%$  fs  
Calib. Interval: Prior to use

Power Supply

Unholtz-Dickie Corp.  
M/N 608PS-1  
S/N 118  
CEL No. 3-686

Range: NA  
Accuracy: NA  
Calib. Interval: NA

## APPENDIX (cont)

### Nomenclature

#### Auto Ranger Modules (2)

Unholtz-Dickie Corp.  
M/N 8PMCVA  
CEL No. 3-686-1  
CEL No. 3-686-2

### Characteristics

Range: Charge Mode - Sensitivity -  
1 to 100 pcmb (peak)/g (peak)  
Frequency response -  
10 Hz to 10 kHz =  $\pm 1\%$   
5 Hz to 10 kHz =  $\pm 2\%$   
3 Hz to 10 kHz =  $\pm 4\%$   
Voltage Mode -  
1 to 100 mV (peak)/g (peak)  
Accuracy: Gain -  $\pm 1.5\%$  at any point on  
the dial  
Meter -  $\pm 1\%$  fs  
Calib. Interval: Prior to use

#### Piezoelectric Accelerometer

Endevco  
M/N 2213C  
S/N KA 91  
CEL No. 3-447-1

Range: 5 to 4000 Hz  
0 to 10,000 g  
Frequency response -  
 $\pm 2.5\%$  to 4000 Hz nominal  
Sensitivity -  
35.3 rms mV/g peak  
Transverse sensitivity - 2.2%  
Accuracy: Linearity -  $\pm 1.0\%$  fs  
Calib. Interval: 6 months

#### Piezoelectric Accelerometer

MB Electronics  
M/N 304  
S/N 163201  
CEL No. 3-449-9

Range: 0.15 to 10,000 g  
Sensitivity - 54.5 rms mV/g peak  
Frequency response - 2 Hz to 7 kc  
Accuracy: Linearity -  $\pm 1.0\%$  fs  
Calib. Interval: 1 month

#### Piezoelectric Accelerometer

MB Electronics  
M/N 305  
S/N 182036  
CEL No. 3-449-17

Range: 0.15 to 10,000 g  
Sensitivity - 16.8 rms mV/g peak  
Frequency response - 2 Hz to 7 kc  
Accuracy: Linearity -  $\pm 1.0\%$  fs  
Calib. Interval: Prior to use

#### Piezoelectric Accelerometer

MB Electronics  
M/N 305  
S/N 182032  
CEL No. 3-449-18

Range: 0.15 to 10,000 g  
Sensitivity - 17.2 rms mV/g peak  
Frequency response - 2 Hz to 7 kc  
Accuracy: Linearity -  $\pm 1\%$  fs  
Calib. Interval: Prior to use

## APPENDIX (concluded)

### Nomenclature

### Characteristics

#### Piezoelectric Accelerometer

MB Electronics  
M/N 305  
S/N 163360  
CEL No. 3-449-19

Range: 0.15 to 10,000 g  
Sensitivity - 18.0 rms mV/g peak  
Frequency response - 2 Hz to 7 kc  
Accuracy: Linearity -  $\pm 1\%$  fs  
Calib. Interval: Prior to use

#### Piezoelectric Accelerometer

MB Electronics  
M/N 305  
S/N 163269  
CEL No. 3-449-20

Range: 0.15 to 10,000 g  
Sensitivity - 17.3 rms mV/g peak  
Frequency response - 2 Hz to 7kc  
Accuracy: Linearity -  $\pm 1.0\%$  fs  
Calib. Interval: Prior to use

#### Piezoelectric Accelerometer

MB Electronics  
M/N 305  
S/N 163294  
CEL No. 3-449-21

Range: 0.15 to 10,000 g  
Sensitivity - 17.6 rms mV/g peak  
Frequency response - 2 Hz to 7 kc  
Charge - 17.9 pC/g  
Accuracy: Linearity -  $\pm 1.0\%$  fs  
Calib. Interval: Prior to use

#### Stop Watch

Braun  
CEL No. 4-643

Range: 1 sec to 30 min  
Accuracy:  $\pm 0.5$  sec  
Calib. Interval: 6 months

All equipment utilized was currently in calibration as outlined in Component Evaluation Laboratories Quality Control Manual.




Figure 7. Rough Handling Test, 9" Forward End Impact




Figure 8. Rough Handling Test, 9" Aft End Impact




Figure 9. Rough Handling Test, 24" Aft Right Corner






Figure 10. Rough Handling Test, 24" Forward Left Corner




Figure 11. Rough Handling Test, 24" Forward End Drop




Figure 12. Rough Handling Test, 24" Aft End Drop

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

## DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R &amp; D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	
Nash-Hammond, Inc. City of Industry, California		Unclassified	
		2b. GROUP	
3. REPORT TITLE			
DYNAMIC DROP AND VIBRATION TESTS OF A CNU-104/E SHIPPING CONTAINER			
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)			
Final Report - 19 December 1966 to 9 May 1967			
5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name)			
Dave Bogan		C. M. Swatek, Jr., Test Engineer	
6. REPORT DATE	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES	7b. NO. OF REFS	
January 1968	35		
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.	8b. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
F08635-67-C-0049			
9. PROJECT NO.	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)		
	AFATL-TR-68-12		
10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT			
This document is subject to special export controls and each transmittal to foreign governments or foreign nationals may be made only with prior approval of the Air Force Armament Laboratory (ATWD), Eglin AFB, Florida 32542.			
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY	
Available in DDC		Air Force Armament Laboratory Air Force System Command Eglin Air Force Base, Florida	
13. ABSTRACT			
<p>This report presents the results of two dynamics: Rough Handling and Vibration tests of a CNU-104/E Shipping Container. The container was designed to protect the fully loaded TFDM dispenser and pallet from damage during shipment. The purpose of the tests was to ascertain the practicability of a rotationally molded high density linear polyethylene shipping container to provide protection during shipment and long-term storage. Two test specimens, No. 1 and No. 2 for vibration testing, and one test specimen for rough handling testing, were subjected to all tests with successful results. The procedures and results presented within this report include those performed outside the facilities of Nash-Hammond industry.</p>			

DD FORM 1 NOV 61 1473

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

**Security Classification**

14.

## KEY WORDS

**LINK A**

LINK B

LINK C

**ROLE**

WT

[illegible]

WT

NAME	ROLE
Mr. J. Edgar Hoover	Director
Mr. Clegg	Chief of Bureau
Mr. Glavin	Chief of Bureau
Mr. Ladd	Chief of Bureau
Mr. Nichols	Chief of Bureau
Mr. Rosen	Chief of Bureau
Mr. Tracy	Chief of Bureau
Mr. Carson	Chief of Bureau
Mr. Egan	Chief of Bureau
Mr. Gurnea	Chief of Bureau
Mr. Hendon	Chief of Bureau
Mr. Pennington	Chief of Bureau
Mr. Quinn	Chief of Bureau
Mr. Nease	Chief of Bureau
Mr. Gandy	Chief of Bureau

WT

TEDM Dispenser  
Drop (Rough Handling) tests  
Vibration tests

1978: 1

UNCLASSIFIED

**Security Classification**